Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
Nuclear Physics A 00 (2014) 1–8
Nuclear Physics A

Experimental results and phenomenology of quarkonium production in relativistic nuclear collisions

Anton Andronic

Reasearch Division and EMMI, GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany

arXiv:1409.5778v2 [nucl-ex] 15 Oct 2014

Abstract

An overview of recent measurements of quarkonium production in nucleus-nucleus collisions and their understanding in theoretical models is given.

Keywords: deconfined matter, quarkonium suppression, (re)generation

1. Introduction

Among the various suggested probes of deconfinement, charmonium ($c\bar{c}$) states play a distinctive role. The J/ψ meson is the first hadron for which a clear mechanism of suppression in deconfined matter ("quark-gluon plasma", QGP) was proposed based on the color analogue of Debye screening [1]. Current terminology includes "dissociation" and "melting", which are somewhat harder terms compared to the initial proposal of screening as "hindered binding" of c and $\bar{c}$ quarks. Further refinements, including all quarkonium species, $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$, led to the picture of "sequential suppression" [2–4]: a hierarchy of quarkonium dissociation dependent on the binding energy (size) of the quarkonium state, which could give information on the temperature of the medium, given that the Debye length in deconfined matter has a pronounced temperature dependence [3]. It was pointed out early-on that the Debye screening phenomenon is a low-$p_{\rm T}$ effect [2, 5], an issue highlighted in current research [6]. Lattice QCD calculations can give information on the screening [7–10], a subject of intense current research [11–17] (see a review in [18]). The theoretical challenge [19] is illustrated by the spread of results obtained with various approaches [20]. A review of charmonium data at the SPS and RHIC and its interpretation in the screening scenario is available in ref. [21].

Novel quarkonium production mechanisms were proposed in the year 2000. In the statistical hadronization model [22], the charm (bottom) quarks and antiquarks, produced in initial hard collisions, thermalize in QGP and are "distributed" into hadrons at chemical freeze-out. It is assumed that no quarkonium state is produced in the deconfined state (full suppression). Quarkonia are produced, together with all other hadrons, at chemical freeze-out (hadronization) [22, 23]. A variant with partial suppression of initial charmonium production has been also proposed [24]. An important aspect in this scenario is the canonical suppression of open charm or bottom hadrons [25, 26], which determines the centrality dependence of production yields in this model. The overall magnitude is determined by the input charm (bottom) production cross section [27]. See a review in [28] and more recent predictions of this model in [29] and of a similar approach in [30].

Kinetic (re)combination of heavy quarks and antiquarks in QGP [31] is an alternative quarkonium production mechanism. In this transport model (see ref. [32–35] for recent results) there is continuous dissociation and (re)generation of quarkonium over the entire lifetime of the deconfined stage. A hydrodynamical-like expansion of the fireball of deconfined matter, constrained by data, is part of the model, alongside an implementation of the screening mechanism

with inputs from lattice QCD. Other important ingredients are parton-level cross sections and, as in the case of the statistical hadronization model, the production cross section of initial $c\bar{c}$ ($b\bar{b}$) pairs and quarkonium states.

A wealth of data on charmonium and bottomonium production in nucleus-nucleus collisions has become recently available at RHIC [20, 36–41] and at the LHC [42–49], significantly extending our understanding of quarkonium production in deconfined matter. The new data in proton (deuteron) collisions with nuclei, both at RHIC [20, 50] and at the LHC [51–56], are also significant. Initially intended to quantify the so-called "cold nuclear effects", effects of nuclear collisions not associated with hot (deconfined) matter, namely shadowing/saturation at collider energies, these data have revealed interesting aspects of quarkonium production.

2. Charmonium

The measurement of J/ψ production in Pb–Pb collisions at the LHC was expected to be decisive in clarifying the question of suppression via the Debye screening mechanism and answering what (re)generation scenarios are viable production mechanisms. The data measured at high $p_{\rm T}$ [43] showed a pronounced suppression of J/ψ in Pb–Pb compared to pp collisions and of the same magnitude as that of open-charm hadrons. This may indicate that the high-$p_{\rm T}$ charm quarks that form either D or J/ψ mesons had the same dynamics, determined by the energy loss process in deconfined matter.


R_AA J/ψ
ALICE (|y|<0.8, ±13% syst.), √s_NN=2.76 TeV
PHENIX (|y|<0.35, ±12% syst.), √s_NN=0.2 TeV
STAR (|y|<1.0, ±13% syst.), √s_NN=0.2 TeV
midrapidity
dN_ch /dη |_η=0
ALICE (2.5<y<4.0, ±15% syst.), √s_NN=2.76 TeV
PHENIX (1.2<y<2.2, ±9% syst.), √s_NN=0.2 TeV
forward rapidity

Figure 1. The dependence of the nuclear modification factor $R_{\rm AA}$ for inclusive J/ψ production on the charged-particle pseudorapidity density $\mathrm{d}N_{\rm ch}/\mathrm{d}\eta$ (at η=0) at midrapidity (left panel) and at forward rapidity (right panel). The data are integrated over $p_{\rm T}$ and are from the PHENIX [36, 57] and STAR [39] collaborations at RHIC and the ALICE collaboration [48] at the LHC. Note the additional systematic uncertainties of the data quoted in the legend.

The first LHC measurement of the overall (inclusive in $p_{\rm T}$) production [42], showed at forward rapidities values of the nuclear modification factor $R_{\rm AA}$ significantly larger than those measured at RHIC energies. The full-statistics data of Run-1 confirmed this, see Fig. 1, where the LHC data [48] are compared to RHIC data [36, 39, 57] at midrapidity and forward rapidity. The comparison is performed as a function of the charged particle pseudorapidity density $\mathrm{d}N_{\rm ch}/\mathrm{d}\eta$, measured around η=0, which is a measure of the energy density of the system. In the Debye screening scenario, the larger energy density reached at the LHC is expected to lead to a reduced production of charmonium. In addition, the larger parton shadowing/saturation expected at the LHC implies lower $R_{\rm AA}$ values compared to the RHIC energy. The opposite is observed, demonstrating that novel production mechanisms, beyond (in addition to) the Debye screening effects are at work. This is a generic expectation of both statistical hadronization and kinetic (re)combination models, which predicted [27, 32, 33] larger $R_{\rm AA}$ values at the LHC compared to RHIC.



Figure 2. Centrality dependence of the nuclear modification factor for inclusive J/ψ production at the LHC. The data at midrapidity [48] are compared to model calculations: the statistical hadronization model [29] and transport models of the TAMU [33, 58] and Tsinghua [32, 35] groups. The bands are denoting part of the uncertainty on the charm production cross section.

The data are well described by the statistical hadronization model [29] and by transport models [33, 35], as illustrated in Fig. 2 for midrapidity data at the LHC. This shows that J/ψ production is a probe of deconfinement, confirming the initial idea [1], but may not be a simple "thermometer" of the medium as initially hoped. Within the statistical model, the charmonium states become probes of the phase boundary between the deconfined and the hadronic phases. This extends the family of quarks employed for the determination of the hadronization temperature via the conjectured connection to the chemical freeze-out temperature extracted from fits of statistical model calculations to yields of hadrons with u, d, and s quarks [59].


Inclusive J/ψ→e+e-
ALICE Preliminary, Pb-Pb, √sNN=2.76 TeV, |y|<0.8, centrality 0-40%
PHENIX, Au-Au, √sNN=0.2 TeV, |y|<0.35, centrality 0-40%
STAR, Au-Au, √sNN=0.2 TeV, |y|<1, centrality 0-60%
R AA
pT (GeV/c)
Pb-Pb √sNN = 2.76 TeV and Au-Au √sNN = 0.2 TeV
ALICE J/ψ → μ+μ-, 2.5<y<4, centrality 0%–20%
global syst. = ± 8%
PHENIX J/ψ → μ+μ-, 1.2<|y|<2.2, centrality 0%–20%
global syst. = ± 10%

Figure 3. Transverse momentum dependence of the nuclear modification factor for J/ψ production in central collisions measured at RHIC [36, 39, 57] and at the LHC [48, 60] at midrapidity (left panel) and at forward rapidity (right panel; plot from ref. [48]).

In transport models, about 60-80% of the J/ψ yield in central Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\rm NN}}$ = 2.76 TeV originates from (re)combination of c and $\bar{c}$ quarks, the rest being primordial J/ψ mesons that have survived in the deconfined medium. In Au–Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\rm NN}}$ = 200 GeV that fraction is about 30-50%. It is worth pointing out that the input $c\bar{c}$ production cross section in the statistical and transport models differs, at the LHC, by almost a factor of 2; further understanding of this difference and better constraints on $\sigma_{c\bar{c}}$ from data are needed in order to disentangle the

two competing models. The study of J/ψ yield relative to the inclusive $c\bar{c}$ yield was advocated [23, 61]; to date, this is limited by the large uncertainties in the experimental determination of $\sigma_{c\bar{c}}$ in nucleus-nucleus collisions.

Another dramatic difference between the LHC and the RHIC data on J/ψ production is observed in the transverse momentum dependence of the nuclear modification factor, shown in Fig. 3. This is arguably the most prominent difference seen between the LHC and RHIC data in all the multitude of observables available to date. Recalling that the Debye screening mechanism is expected to be effective at low $p_{\rm T}$ [2, 5], the features seen in Fig. 3 give strong support to the interpretation of J/ψ production at the LHC as dominated by generation at the hadronization or by (re)generation throughout the QGP lifetime, as the statistical hadronization model or the kinetic models, respectively, imply. It was shown with transport models [33, 35] that, as expected, (re)generation is predominantly a low-$p_{\rm T}$ phenomenon, as illustrated by the comparison of LHC data to model predictions in Fig. 4 (left panel). This translates to average values of $p_{\rm T}$ very different at the LHC compared to lower energies [35].


R_{AA}
Inclusive J/ψ → μ⁺μ⁻, Pb-Pb $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ = 2.76 TeV
ALICE (PLB 743 (2014) 314), centr. 0%–20%, 2.5<y<4
global syst.= ± 8%
Transport model (K. Zhou & al, PRC 89 (2014) 054911)
Transport model (X. Zhao & al., NPA 859 (2011) 114)
Primordial J/ψ (w/ shadowing)
Regeneration J/ψ (w/ shadowing)
Primordial J/ψ (w/ shadowing)
Regenerated J/ψ (w/ shadowing)
$p_{\rm T}$ (GeV/c)
v_2
ALICE (Pb-Pb $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ = 2.76 TeV), centrality 20%-60%, 2.5 < y < 4.0
K. Zhou et al., b thermalized
K. Zhou et al., b not thermalized
X. Zhao et al., b thermalized
global syst. = ± 1.4%
$p_{\rm T}$ (GeV/c)

Figure 4. Transverse momentum dependence of the nuclear modification factor (left panel [48]) and elliptic flow coefficient v_2 (right panel [46]) of J/ψ. The ALICE data at the LHC are at forward rapidity and are compared to transport model predictions of the TAMU (Zhao et al. [33, 58]) and Tsinghua (Zhou et al. [35]) groups.

J/ψ data in Cu–Cu [39] and Cu–Au [41] collisions at RHIC exhibit a suppression close in magnitude to that observed in Au–Au collisions. At lower RHIC energies, measurements [62] show a J/ψ suppression similar in magnitude to that measured at the top RHIC energy. This is in agreement with earlier measurements at the SPS and was implicitly predicted within the statistical hadronization model [23]; it is described in transport models [62, 63].

The measurement of J/ψ elliptic flow at the LHC [46, 47] brings another argument in favor of charmonium production from thermalized c and $\bar{c}$ quarks. The transport model predictions [58, 64] describe well the data, as shown in Fig. 4 (right panel). The recent measurement by the CMS collaboration [47] indicates that prompt J/ψ mesons exhibit elliptic flow for $p_{\rm T}$ as large as 10 GeV/c. We recall that the J/ψ data at RHIC are compatible with a null flow signal [37]. A v_2 signal was measured for J/ψ at the SPS [65] and was interpreted as a path-length dependence of the screening.

The production of the $\psi(2S)$ charmonium state was proposed early on as a signature of the QCD phase boundary [22, 68] and also to possibly reveal in-medium effects on decay properties [69]. Present data on $\psi(2S)$ production at colliders [66, 70], Fig. 5 (left panel), is affected by rather large statistical uncertainties and also by imposed kinematic cuts to perform the challenging measurement of $\psi(2S)$. This measurement offers the potential to discriminate between the statistical hadronization and the kinetic models, see Fig. 5 (right panel). A significant progress on the experimental side is expected with the upgraded ALICE detector at the LHC [71].

The measurements of J/ψ production in p–Pb collisions at the LHC [51, 52] exhibit features very different than in Pb–Pb collisions [60]. The data are described by shadowing calculations [72, 73], but not in all details, though. A saturation model [74] underpredicts the data. The mechanism of energy loss in cold nuclear matter [75], in conjunction with shadowing effects, provides a better description of the data. The implications of this mechanism for Pb–Pb collisions has just been put forward [76]. Hot matter effects on J/ψ production in p–Pb collisions have also been proposed [77]. The centrality (event activity) dependence of J/ψ production exhibits a host of features [78, 79], which


CMS Preliminary PbPb & pp √sNN = 2.76 TeV
3 < pT < 30 GeV/c, 1.6 < |y| < 2.4
6.5 < pT < 30 GeV/c, |y| < 1.6
95% CL
ALICE Preliminary PbPb √sNN = 2.76 TeV & pp √s = 7 TeV
pT < 3 GeV/c, 2.5 < |y| < 4
3 < pT < 8 GeV/c, 2.5 < |y| < 4
95% CL
Cent. 0-100%
[Nψ(2S)/NJ/ψ]PbPb / [Nψ(2S)/NJ/ψ]pp
Npart
ψ(2S)
χc
transport model
statistical model
Pb-Pb √sNN=2.76 TeV, y=0
RAA/RAA J/ψ
Npart

Figure 5. Centrality dependence of the ratio of the nuclear modification factor of higher charmonium states to that of J/ψ for the LHC energy. The present data on $\psi(2S)$ are shown in the left panel (plot from [66]). In the right panel are shown transport model [33] and statistical hadronization model [67] predictions for $\psi(2S)$ (continuous lines) and $\chi_{c1,2}$ (dashed lines).

are yet to be understood. Interesting aspects are revealed by the measurement of $\psi(2S)$ production in d–Au collisions at RHIC [50] and in p–Pb at the LHC [54, 56], indicating possible final-state effects.

3. Bottomonium

Recent measurements of the production of bottomonium ($b\bar{b}$) states at the LHC [44, 49, 53] and at RHIC [20, 40] add an important new aspect to the quarkonium dissociation story. The nuclear modification factor for the Υ states measured at the LHC at midrapidity was interpreted as evidence for the sequential suppression mechanism [44]. In this picture, the yield of the $\Upsilon(2S)$ is expected to vanish, while a non-zero yield is measured [44].



Figure 6. The dependence of the nuclear modification factor $R_{\rm AA}$ for Υ production at the LHC on centrality (left panel) and on rapidity (right panel, plot from [49]). The data are integrated over $p_{\rm T}$ and are from the PHENIX [20] and STAR [40] collaborations at RHIC and the CMS [44] and ALICE [49] collaborations at the LHC. Note the additional systematic uncertainties of the data quoted in the legend. The transport model predictions in the right panel are from [34].

An Υ suppression similar in magnitude to that measured at the LHC is observed at RHIC [20, 40], see Fig. 6 (left panel). This brings to mind an analogous pattern for J/ψ at the SPS and at RHIC energies, already mentioned above:

the magnitude of its suppression was observed to be similar up to the top RHIC energy. The Υ suppression observed at RHIC is described by transport model predictions [34, 80], see model comparisons in [40].

The data on $\Upsilon(1S)$ production at forward rapidity [49] exhibit a stronger suppression than at mid-rapidity [44], see Fig. 6 (right panel). This recalls the observation at RHIC of a stronger suppression of J/ψ at forward rapidity than at midrapidity, which was interpreted as evidence for J/ψ production via the statistical hadronization mechanism [27].

The $\Upsilon(1S)$ data at the LHC indicate that the Debye screening mechanism, implemented in a hydrodynamical approach [81], does not describe the measurements [49]. Transport model predictions [34] describe the features of the LHC data [49], see Fig. 6 (right panel), exhibiting though a much weaker rapidity dependence than the data. They indicate a rather small (re)generation component for $\Upsilon(1S)$ and a large primordial production [34, 82]; $\Upsilon(2S)$ production arises in transport models exclusively from (re)generation [82].



Figure 7. Track multiplicity dependence of the ratio of yields of $\Upsilon(2S)$ and $\Upsilon(1S)$ bottomonium states, measured at the LHC in pp, p–Pb and Pb–Pb collisions by the CMS collaboration [53]. The lines are thermal model predictions for central Pb–Pb collisions; the full line includes an estimate of the contribution of the production in the corona of the colliding nuclei.

The production ratio $\Upsilon(2S)/\Upsilon(1S)$ is expected in the statistical model [67] to be very different in Pb–Pb compared to pp collisions. Such an expectation is exhibited by the recent data at the LHC [53], shown in Fig. 7. A gradual decrease of the yield ratio $\Upsilon(2S)/\Upsilon(1S)$ is seen as a function of track multiplicity in pp, p–Pb and Pb–Pb collisions, a trend which is yet to be understood. The data are compatible, for central Pb–Pb collisions, to the value predicted by the statistical hadronization model for $T = 159$ MeV. This provides a tantalizing possibility of adding the bottom flavor towards constraining even further the QCD phase boundary with nucleus-nucleus data at high energies.

4. Conclusions and outlook

The charmonium data in Pb–Pb collisions at the LHC, in conjunction with data at RHIC, show that (re)generation in deconfined matter during the QGP lifetime or generation at the chemical freeze-out (hadronization) appear to be the only mechanisms of production that describe the measurements. While rather convincing at the LHC, the mechanism of generation by statistical hadronization may be disputed for RHIC (and SPS) energies, where transport models currently indicate a fraction of (re)generated charmonium below 50%. Even as it remains important to clarify all details, it seems safe to affirm, based on models, that we do see in experiments charmonium suppression in deconfined matter. The LHC data on bottomonium suppression were followed very recently by data at RHIC, where the measurement is clearly much more challenging. More theoretical insight is awaited in the bottomonium sector.

Even as "generation" and "(re)generation" seem equivalent terms, they label two rather different pictures of quarkonium production; discriminating between them will help providing answers to fundamental questions related to the fate of quarkonium in a hot, deconfined, medium [9, 19, 83]. Is any hadron having a chance of survival in the hot and dense soup of deconfined quarks and gluons? Do charm (or bottom) quarks hadronize at the same temperature as their lighter siblings [84, 85]? Quarkonium data at RHIC and in particular at the full LHC energy will hopefully help clarifying such questions in the next years, providing a better understanding of deconfined QCD matter. Obviously, sustained effort on the theoretical front is needed along the way. New theoretical ideas continue to appear [86].

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the RHIC and LHC collaborations for making available their results in a very accessible way. For discussions and clarifications about the data I thank R. Arnaldi, I. Arsene, C. Blume, G. Bruno, J. Castillo, T. Dahms, R. Granier de Cassagnac, B. Hong, D. Morrison, J. Nagle, E. Scomparin, C. Suire, M. Winn, and N. Xu. For enlightening discussions on theoretical models I am grateful to P. Braun-Munzinger, R. Rapp, K. Redlich, J. Stachel, X. Zhao, and P. Zhuang.

References

[1] T. Matsui, H. Satz, Phys. Lett. B **178**, 416 (1986)
[2] F. Karsch, H. Satz, Z. Phys. C **51**, 209 (1991)
[3] S. Digal, P. Petreczky, H. Satz, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 094015 (2001), hep-ph/0106017
[4] F. Karsch, D. Kharzeev, H. Satz, Phys. Lett. B **637**, 75 (2006), hep-ph/0512239
[5] J. Blaizot, J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 232 (1989)
[6] B. Kopeliovich, I. Potashnikova, I. Schmidt, et al., talk at Quark Matter 2014 (2014), 1407.8080
[7] M. Asakawa, T. Hatsuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 012001 (2004), hep-lat/0308034
[8] S. Datta, F. Karsch, P. Petreczky, et al., Phys. Rev. D **69**, 094507 (2004), hep-lat/0312037
[9] A. Mocsy, P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014501 (2008), 0705.2559
[10] A. Mocsy, P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 211602 (2007), 0706.2183
[11] K. Morita, S. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 044917 (2012), 1012.3110
[12] H. Ding, A. Francis, O. Kaczmarek, et al., Phys. Rev. D **86**, 014509 (2012), 1204.4945
[13] T. Hayata, K. Nawa, T. Hatsuda, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 101901 (2013), 1211.4942
[14] S. H. Lee, K. Morita, T. Song, et al., Phys. Rev. D **89**, 094015 (2014), 1304.4092
[15] A. Rothkopf, JHEP **1404**, 085 (2014), 1312.3246
[16] S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, et al., JHEP **1404**, 132 (2014), 1401.5940
[17] G. Aarts, C. Allton, T. Harris, et al., JHEP **1407**, 097 (2014), 1402.6210
[18] A. Mocsy, P. Petreczky, M. Strickland, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28**, 1340012 (2013), 1302.2180
[19] M. Laine (2011), 1108.5965
[20] A. Adare, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration) (2014), 1404.2246
[21] L. Kluberg, H. Satz, Landolt-Börnstein **I/23** (2010), 0901.3831
[22] P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **490**, 196 (2000), nucl-th/0007059
[23] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, et al., Nucl. Phys. A **789**, 334 (2007), nucl-th/0611023
[24] L. Grandchamp, R. Rapp, Phys. Lett. B **523**, 60 (2001), hep-ph/0103124
[25] P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, Nucl. Phys. A **690**, 119 (2001), nucl-th/0012064
[26] M. I. Gorenstein, A. Kostyuk, H. Stoecker, et al., Phys. Lett. B **524**, 265 (2002), hep-ph/0104071
[27] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, et al., Phys. Lett. B **652**, 259 (2007), nucl-th/0701079
[28] P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, Landolt-Börnstein **I/23** (2010), 0901.2500
[29] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, et al., J. Phys. G **38**, 124081 (2011), 1106.6321
[30] E. Ferreiro, Phys. Lett. B **731**, 57 (2014), 1210.3209
[31] R. L. Thews, M. Schroedter, J. Rafelski, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 054905 (2001), hep-ph/0007323
[32] Y.-P. Liu, Z. Qu, N. Xu, et al., Phys. Lett. B **678**, 72 (2009), 0901.2757
[33] X. Zhao, R. Rapp, Nucl. Phys. A **859**, 114 (2011), 1102.2194
[34] A. Emerick, X. Zhao, R. Rapp, Eur. Phys. J. A **48**, 72 (2012), 1111.6537
[35] K. Zhou, N. Xu, Z. Xu, et al., Phys. Rev. C **89**, 054911 (2014), 1401.5845
[36] A. Adare, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **84**, 054912 (2011), 1103.6269
[37] L. Adamczyk, et al. (STAR Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 5, 052301 (2013), 1212.3304
[38] L. Adamczyk, et al. (STAR Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **722**, 55 (2013), 1208.2736
[39] L. Adamczyk, et al. (STAR Collaboration) (2013), 1310.3563
[40] L. Adamczyk, et al. (STAR Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **735**, 127 (2014), 1312.3675
[41] C. Aidala, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration) (2014), 1404.1873
[42] B. Abelev, et al. (ALICE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 072301 (2012), 1202.1383

[43] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), JHEP **1205**, 063 (2012), 1201.5069
[44] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 222301 (2012), 1208.2826
[45] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), *J/ψ results from CMS in PbPb collisions, with 150 μb^{-1} data*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIN-12-014, CERN, Geneva (2012)
[46] E. Abbas, et al. (ALICE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 162301 (2013), 1303.5880
[47] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), *Measurement of the azimuthal anisotropy of prompt and non-prompt J/ψ in PbPb collisions at* $\sqrt{s_{\rm NN}}$ = 2.76 *TeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIN-12-001, CERN, Geneva (2013)
[48] B. B. Abelev, et al. (ALICE Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **743**, 314 (2014), 1311.0214
[49] B. B. Abelev, et al. (ALICE Collaboration) (2014), 1405.4493
[50] A. Adare, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 20, 202301 (2013), 1305.5516
[51] B. B. Abelev, et al. (ALICE Collaboration), JHEP **1402**, 073 (2014), 1308.6726
[52] R. Aaij, et al. (LHCb Collaboration), JHEP **1402**, 072 (2014), 1308.6729
[53] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), JHEP **04**, 103 (2014), 1312.6300
[54] B. B. Abelev, et al. (ALICE Collaboration) (2014), 1405.3796
[55] R. Aaij, et al. (LHCb collaboration), JHEP **1407**, 094 (2014), 1405.5152
[56] R. Arnaldi (ALICE Collaboration), proceedings of Quark Matter 2014 (2014), 1407.7451
[57] A. Adare, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 232301 (2007), nucl-ex/0611020
[58] X. Zhao, A. Emerick, R. Rapp, Nucl. Phys. A **904-905**, 611c (2013), 1210.6583
[59] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **673**, 142 (2009), 0812.1186
[60] J. Book (ALICE Collaboration), talk at Quark Matter 2014 (2014)
[61] H. Satz, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2013**, 242918 (2013), 1303.3493
[62] A. Adare, et al. (PHENIX Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **86**, 064901 (2012), 1208.2251
[63] X. Zhao, R. Rapp, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 064905 (2010), 1008.5328
[64] Y. Liu, N. Xu, P. Zhuang, Nucl. Phys. A **834**, 317C (2010), 0910.0959
[65] F. Prino, et al. (NA50 Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. C **61**, 853 (2009), 0906.5376
[66] S. Chatrchyan, et al. (CMS Collaboration), *Measurement of the ψ(2S) meson in PbPb collisions at* $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ = 2.76 *TeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIN-12-007, CERN, Geneva (2012)
[67] A. Andronic, F. Beutler, P. Braun-Munzinger, et al., Phys. Lett. B **678**, 350 (2009), 0904.1368
[68] H. Sorge, E. V. Shuryak, I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2775 (1997), hep-ph/9705329
[69] L. Grandchamp, R. Rapp, G. E. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 212301 (2004), hep-ph/0306077
[70] R. Arnaldi (ALICE Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. A **904-905**, 595c (2013), 1211.2578
[71] B. Abelev et al (The ALICE Collaboration), J. Phys. G **41**, 087001 (2014)
[72] J. Albacete, N. Armesto, R. Baier, et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **22**, 1330007 (2013), 1301.3395
[73] E. Ferreiro, F. Fleuret, J. Lansberg, et al., Phys. Rev. C **88**, 047901 (2013), 1305.4569
[74] H. Fujii, K. Watanabe, Nucl. Phys. A **915**, 1 (2013), 1304.2221
[75] F. Arleo, S. Peigné, JHEP **1303**, 122 (2013), 1212.0434
[76] F. Arleo, S. Peigné, (2014), 1407.5054
[77] Y. Liu, C. M. Ko, T. Song, Phys. Lett. B **728**, 437 (2014), 1309.5113
[78] I. Lakomov (ALICE Collaboration), proceedings of Quark Matter 2014 (2014), 1408.0702
[79] J. M. Blanco (ALICE Collaboration), talk at Quark Matter 2014 (2014)
[80] Y. Liu, B. Chen, N. Xu, et al., Phys. Lett. B **697**, 32 (2011), 1009.2585
[81] M. Strickland, AIP Conf. Proc. **1520**, 179 (2013), 1207.5327
[82] K. Zhou, N. Xu, P. Zhuang, talk at Quark Matter 2014 (2014), 1408.3900
[83] H. Liu, K. Rajagopal, U. A. Wiedemann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 182301 (2007), hep-ph/0607062
[84] R. Bellwied, S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 202302 (2013), 1305.6297
[85] A. Bazavov, H. T. Ding, P. Hegde, et al., Phys. Lett. B **737**, 210 (2014), 1404.4043
[86] D. E. Kharzeev (2014), 1409.2496